

1
2
3
4
5
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
8 AT SEATTLE

9 MAPLE LEAF ADVENTURES
10 CORPORATION,

11 Petitioner,

12 v.

13 JET TERN MARINE CO., LTD,
14

15 Respondent.

Case No. C18-1321 RSM

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

16 This matter comes before the Court *sua sponte*. Petitioner initiated this action with a
17 Petition for Confirmation and Judgment on Foreign Arbitration Award on September 7, 2018.
18 Dkt. #1. Respondent is a Taiwanese company that may control assets in this District. *Id.* at 1-2.
19 At the time Petitioner filed its petition, it explained that an arbitration award was entered between
20 the parties, but due to ongoing investigations and Respondent's appeal of the award through a
21 Norwegian court system, Petitioner had not yet served Respondent.
22

23 This Court previously granted Petitioner a deadline of January 16, 2019 to serve
24 Respondent. Dkt. #6. It appears that parties had counsel for arbitration and corresponded
25 previously, and the Court cautioned that "[s]ervice should have been made as soon as this case
26 was filed." Dkt. #14 at 2. On January 22, 2019, the Court granted Petitioner's second motion for
27 clerk's service on a foreign individual pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(f)(2)(C)(ii). Accordingly,
28

1 this Court directed the Clerk to send by international registered mail the Summons, the Petition
2 to Confirmation and Judgment on Foreign Arbitral Award, and the Corporate Disclosure
3 Statement to Respondent's address in Taiwan. *Id.* at 2.

4 This case has been pending since September 7, 2018. Over a year has elapsed since the
5 Court directed service by international mail, yet Petitioner has provided no proof of service or
6 any docket activity since that date. The Court has previously cautioned Plaintiff for failure to
7 diligently prosecute this case. In denying Plaintiff's motion for a 90-day extension of time to
8 serve Defendants, the Court observed that the initial disclosure and joint status report deadlines
9 "passed without a word from the parties." Dkt. #6 at 1. Likewise, Petitioner failed to timely move
10 for an extension on time to serve Defendants, filing only after the 90-day deadline under Rule
11 4(m) had expired. *Id.* at 2.

12 The Court needs to hear from Petitioner on this issue. In Response to this Order, Petitioner
13 must write a short statement telling the Court (1) why service in this case is or is not proper; and
14 (2) why this matter should not be dismissed without prejudice for failure to prosecute. This
15 Response may not exceed **six (6) pages**. Accordingly, the Court hereby finds and ORDERS that
16 Plaintiff shall file a Response to this Order to Show Cause containing the detail above no later
17 than **seven (7) days** from the date of this Order. Plaintiff's failure to file this Response will result
18 in dismissal of this case.

19 DATED this 14th day of February 2020.

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28


RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28